

# House of Representatives

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 10: 12: *The same Lord, who is over all is rich unto all who call upon Him.*

Our Heavenly Father, inspire us to enter upon the tasks and responsibilities of this new day with noble desires and lofty purpose surging through our minds and hearts.

May we make the most of every opportunity and invest the best we have of wisdom and understanding, of intelligence and experience, of effort and enthusiasm in solving life's many problems.

Help us to appreciate more fully that the greatness and glory of life consists in doing what we can to make life less difficult for the members of the human family who are finding its struggle so difficult and burdensome.

Grant that we may go forth bravely following in the footsteps of all who have spanned the ages with the glory of service and sacrifice.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## LOUISIANA STATE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON

(Mr. LONG of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this year, as in 16 other years since 1942, the Louisiana State Society of Washington is proud to salute the Nation's Capital on the occasion of Mardi Gras.

This year, I am honored to serve as chairman of the 1964 Mardi Gras ball, which will be held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel tomorrow night, Saturday, February 8.

Louisiana pays tribute to a new chapter in its illustrious history with this year's Mardi Gras ball. To the traditional trappings of Mardi Gras, with its color and pageantry, we have added the marvels of the space age.

The soil where Jean Lafitte once trod is now the home of a vital link in the space crescent, stretching from Cape Kennedy to Houston, Tex.

Our great industries are now joined by new industrial partners, all adding vital components to our Nation's space program.

Only recently, a Saturn rocket lifted the largest payload ever sent into space

from our Atlantic testing ground; vital parts of its booster were made in Louisiana.

Mardi Gras also honors a part of Louisiana which has no equal anywhere: beauty. We are proud of our feminine beauty and in the royal court of this year's Mardi Gras ball is a good sampling of our State's feminine blessings.

The royal assemblage of 28 queens, representing our major fairs and festivals, and 13 maids from all sections of the State, is reigned over by Miss Elizabeth M. Bolton, a 21-year-old Alexandria, La., girl who is queen of the Mardi Gras ball.

Her royal consort is a distinguished citizen of our State, Mr. Harvey Peltier, Sr., of Thibodaux, La. Mr. Peltier, as king of the Mardi Gras, joins an honor roll of some of Louisiana's finest men who have served with distinction in the past.

At another part of the Record, I will list the visiting queens and maids.

## MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION CALLS FOR WORK ACCELERATION

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Mississippi Valley Association has just completed its annual meeting at New Orleans, with thousands in attendance from across the Nation.

This great association, which has led in the drive to develop America's water resources and inland waterways, has adopted a resolution which will command the attention of all Members of the House.

I am informed that this resolution was adopted unanimously, as an expression of the views of the association.

I am confident that it will not only win the attention of all Members of the Congress, but the President as well.

The text of the resolution follows:

### ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

We urge that a significant portion of any Federal funds appropriated for the acceleration of public works in the administration's war on poverty program be expended on authorized, economically justified, permanent, capital investment programs in water resources and river development in the United States of America.

(Mr. FLYNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. FLYNT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

[Mr. O'HARA of Illinois' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

## CASTRO AND GUANTANAMO

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call attention to an article appearing in the New York Times today which says that the Castro decision to shut off the water at our naval base at Guantanamo Bay is a tempest in a teapot. It is nothing of the sort. It is a serious affront to our international prestige.

As one Member of the House, let me say that this fellow Castro has proven beyond reasonable doubt that he is an enemy of this country. I am constrained to ask what the devil is the matter with us when we do not act to meet these challenges? When all that is being done apparently is to have some more discussions on how to run away from a showdown with Castro.

If we are not willing to fight to protect this land of ours, to use force if need be to defend our friends and our citizens, what is going to happen to us is certain. We are going to lose, chunk by chunk, island by island, territory, all around the world, which is exactly what is happening from Panama to Zanzibar.

I am confident that Americans are not so complacent in their material plenty that they do not now realize that we must deal with Castro by force of arms, if necessary. Let us be on with the unpleasant business and the sooner the better.

We have got to change the entire foreign policy of this country from defense to offense—not for imperialism but to assure that peace, justice, and freedom will survive in this world.

## COFFEE PRICES TO SKYROCKET

(Mr. DEROUNIAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, when the housewife goes marketing, these days, she complains about the steady rise in coffee prices. Each week she shops, she pays more for coffee than the week before.

On November 14, 1963, when the House was considering the legislation implementing the International Coffee Agreement, I warned that the only thing this

bill would accomplish would be to fill the pockets of the coffee manipulators. Although the administration assured the Congress that coffee prices would not rise, I predicted they would. The House passed this bill by a vote of 188 to 144.

What has happened in these past 3 months? Coffee prices have spiraled. Last night, the Washington Evening Star carried this report. It is entitled "Coffee Industry Fears Continued Price Increases" and it goes on to say:

Coffee prices have been increased by 7 to 10 cents per pound since mid-December and industry spokesmen say the rise will continue unless the Government steps in with some kind of control.

The import price of green coffee has jumped from 34 cents a pound to 48 cents since mid-January, informed sources said today. However, all this increase has not yet been reflected in the retail prices.

"As soon as our present stocks are depleted I can see no way out of increasing the consumer price," one wholesaler said. The cost to wholesalers has increased about 14 cents a pound since the first of the year, while the cost to the housewife has increased only 7 to 10 cents in the same period.

The American consumers resent this raid on their pocketbooks. They resent being pawns for ill-conceived administration policies. The legislation the Congress passed gave the President the unprecedented power to manipulate coffee prices. President Johnson this week sent a message to the Congress in behalf of consumers. He can start acting for them right now.

#### CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks appearing on page 1835 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 4, in the first column, in line 5, the last word, "off," should be "of." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

	[Roll No. 28]	
Cramer	Horan	St. George
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.	Schwengel
Derwinski	Long, Md.	Scott
Fulton, Tenn.	Martin, Calif.	Siler
Glamo	Milliken	Thompson, Tex.
Hoffman	O'Brien, Ill.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 410 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file certain resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on page 2216 of the Record following the remarks attributed to me, ending with the words "we might consider it", there is a rather long colloquy ending in the third column at the top, which is attributed to me. These are the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

I ask unanimous consent that the Record be so corrected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 7152, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through title VI, ending on line 15 of page 33 of the bill.

Are there any amendments to title VI?

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITENER: Strike out all language commencing with line 1 on page 62 through and including line 15 on page 63, said language being that included under title VI.

(Mr. WHITENER asked and was given permission to proceed for 10 additional minutes.)

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered is a very

simple one. Its purpose is to strike all of that portion of the bill H.R. 7152 designated as "title VI," the title being "Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs."

There have been many of us who have been concerned about this entire legislation, but I think that from the testimony we have heard before the Rules Committee and from the questions asked when the subcommittee was considering the civil rights bill there was more concern expressed about this title than any other one proposal in the bill. I submit to you that there has been no more dangerous proposal before us since I have been in this Congress than the proposal set forth in title VI of the bill.

I should like, if I may, to give you a little of the history of title VI. You will note from the bill on page 34 that the original Department of Justice proposal dealt with this subject in this way:

Sec. 601. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any law of the United States providing or authorizing direct or indirect financial assistance for or in connection with any program or activity by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise, no such law shall be interpreted as requiring that such financial assistance shall be furnished in circumstances under which individuals participating in or benefiting from the program or activity are discriminated against on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin or are denied participation or benefits therein on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin. All contracts made in connection with any such program or activity shall contain such conditions as the President may prescribe for the purpose of assuring that there shall be no discrimination in employment by any contractor or subcontractor on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin.

When this subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considered the bill, they were not content with this language which, in effect, was saying that nothing in the law should be construed as requiring or authorizing the permitting of this type of conduct. But they went ahead and tried to make it very stringent. Then when the midnight candle was burning, they came up with this monstrosity that we are dealing with now, and they carried forward substantially the same language as the subcommittee wrote.

You will note in the proposal of the Department of Justice in the original legislation, the word "religion" was used.

In the committee recommendation, religion was stricken out. I just wonder why that was but I am sure the gentleman from Colorado knows all about it. I wonder if he would tell us why you left religion out of this bill, that is, out of this revised bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, we believe we should not in any way whatsoever invade the area or come in conflict with the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States and in view of recent decisions